

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 and 13 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added.

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,781,976) in view of Mills (U.S. Patent No. 5,252,164). The Office Action also rejects claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujita et al. and Mills and further in view of Hutchinson et al. (GP 2,331,525). These rejections are traversed.

The present claims are directed to a "skin of a seat for a vehicle" and thus require, *inter alia*, that the skin be in the shape of a vehicle seat.

Neither Fujita et al. nor Mills et al. teach or suggest a skin of a seat, as required by the present claims. Thus, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the combination of Fujita et al. and Mills et al., for this reason by itself.

Additionally, the present claims require, *inter alia*, "pluralities of recesses and projections (4, 5) dispersed therein, and the height (h) of the projections (5) is in a range of $0.05 \text{ mm} \leq h \leq 0.35 \text{ mm}$."

The Examiner asserts that "[a]s the projection height increases, the skin has more of a leather-like appearance with minimal color shift and as the height increases, the surface becomes more glossy...[and that] one would have been motivated to optimize...the skin surface roughness to maximize the infrared reflective capabilities and to create an aesthetically pleasing surface that has a leather-like appearance" (Office Action, page 5). Thus, based on the Examiner's assertions, it would appear that one of skill in the art would be motivated to have infinitely high projections, since "as the

projection height rises, the skin has more of a leather-like appearance.” Thus, Applicants submit that, if the Examiner’s assertions are correct, one of skill in the art would not have been motivated to limit the height of projections to 0.355 mm, since doing so, according to the Examiner, would be expected to result in less of a leather-like appearance.

In any case, Applicants have amended the claims to further define that the surface of the claimed skin is a “sueded, roughened surface.” As noted in the present specification, “[t]he surface of the skin is formed into a sueded fashion and hence, is a roughened surface having a plurality of recesses 4 and a plurality of projections 5...” (page 4, lines 4-6, with reference to Fig. 1).

As neither Fujita et al. nor Mills et al. teach or suggest such a sueded surface, the present claims are clearly patentable for this additional reason.

As Fujita et al. and Mills do not teach or suggest 1) a skin of a seat, 2) pluralities of recesses and projections, the height (h) of the projections being in a range of $0.05 \text{ mm} \leq h \leq 0.35 \text{ mm}$, and 3) a sueded surface, Applicants respectfully submit that the invention or the present claims would not have been obvious over the combination of Fujita et al. and Mills et al.

As is the case for Fujita et al. and Mills, Hutchinson et al., which is directed to a composition for treating vinyl surfaces, fails to teach or suggest 1) a skin of a seat, 2) pluralities of recesses and projections, the height (h) of the projections being in a range of $0.05 \text{ mm} \leq h \leq 0.35 \text{ mm}$, and 3) a sueded surface. Applicants thus respectfully submit that Hutchinson et al. fails to make up for the deficiencies in Fujita et

al. and Mills, and the invention of the present claims would thus not have been obvious over the combination of Fujita et al., Mills et al. and Hutchinson et al.

For at least the above reason, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1 and 6 and of claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referring to client-matter number 107348-00119.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Robert K. Carpenter". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Robert K. Carpenter
Registration No. 34,794

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

RKC/tdd